New Mexico EQIP- Santa Rosa Field Office - Guadalupe
FY 2005 Ranking Criteria Worksheet - Irrigated Cropl

Applicant: | Date: | Total Points:
Farm No.: | Tract No.: | CMS Field No's.

1. Water Quantity - 150 Potential Points (33% of Total)

Irrigation Efficiency - Use FIRS to Evaluate. Benchmark & After points equal actual % efficiency times any multiplier. Total equals after minus benchmark pts.				Potential Points
% Efficiency	Before % of Area in Contract before Treatment	After % of Area in Contract After Treatment		
				150
	0%	1. Water Quantity		Total

2. Water Quality - 100 Potential Points (22% of Total)

A. Surface Water Pollutants - 50 Points Maximum

There is a probability that runoff water from irrigated fields contains sediment, salt, pesticides, and/or nutr chemicals). Treatment is needed to prevent these pollutants from entering live waters, or re-entering a sh will be awarded based on distance from the end of field to the nearest live waters or re-entry point into a s there is no run-off, after points will be 0.

Distance of Surface Run-Off to Live Water	Potential Points Points
<100 Ft.	50
101 - 500 Ft.	40
501 - 1,320 Ft.	30
1,321 - 2,640 Ft.	20
>2,640 Ft.	0
A. Surface Water	Total

B. Ground Water Pollutants - 50 Points Maximum

There is a probability that irrigation water containing salt, pesticides, and/or nutrients (or other associated ground water. Treatment is needed to prevent these pollutants from contaminating ground water, throughl flow into wells. Points to be awarded based on depth to the water table, or elimination of any direct disch

Depth to Water Table	Potential Points
1 - 10 Ft **or** elimination of any direct discharge into ground water.	50
10 - 50 Ft.	30
50 -100 Ft.	15
>100 Ft. B. Ground Water	0
2. Water Quality	Total

New Mexico EQIP- Santa Rosa Field Office - Guadalupe
FY 2004 Ranking Criteria Worksheet - Irrigated Cropl

Applicant: 0 Date: 1/0/1900 Total Points:

Farm No.: 0 Tract No.: 0 CMS Field No's.

FY 2004 Ranking Criteria Worksheet - Irrigated Cropland, page 2

3. Selected Conservation Practice(s) - 150 Potential Points (34% of

	Potential Points
Soil Erosion (Irrigation Induced)	
Irrigation Land Leveling (> 100 Cubic yards per acre) (464)	**10**
Pasture Planting (512)	**20**
Water Quality (Excessive Nutrients & Organics in Surface Water)	
Irrigation Land Leveling (> 100 Cubic yards per acre) (464)	**10**
Water Quantity (Inefficient Water Use on Irrigated Land)	
Irrigation Water Conveyance	
Concrete Lined Ditch (428)	**50**
Irrigation Pipeline (430)	**50**
LEPA Conversion (442)	**50**
Irrigation Land Leveling (> 100 Cubic yards per acre) (464)	**10**
3. Selected Conservation Practices	**Total**

4. Other Considerations - 50 Potential Points (11% of Tota

	Potential Points
A. At risk species are in the area and the contract will enhance habitat for the species.	**15**
B. Treatment of this land could have a beneficial impact on a 303d listed stream segment.	**10**
C. Treatment of this land could enhance the benefits of an active/planned section 319 project	**10**
D. The land is within a NMED designated Catergory I watershed.	**15**
4. Other Considerations	**Total**

Total Points (After minus Benchmark):

Producer	Date
Designated Conservationist	Date

County
land

0

Benchmark Points	After Points
0	0
0	0
0	0
0	0
0	0
0	0
0	0
0	0
0	

rients (or other associated
hared irrigation system. Points
shared irrigation system. If

Benchmark Points Points	After Points
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	

l chemicals) is leaching into the
h leaching and direct return
harge to ground water

Benchmark Points	After Points
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	

County
land

0
0

f Total)

Percent Need to be Installed	After Points
0	

al)

Benchmark Points	After Points
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	

Sec 1	0
Sec 2	0

Sec 3	0
Sec 4	0
Total Points	0